



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/027,516

12/21/2001

Sebastian Bohm

TGZ-001CRCE5

3707

959 7590 09/09/2008

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP  
FLOOR 30, SUITE 3000  
ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

ALEXANDER, LYLE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/09/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/027,516	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BOHM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Lyle A. Alexander	<b>Art Unit</b> 1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 24-41, 48 and 49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 24-41 and 48-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-22, 24-41 and 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The original specification does not teach the claimed diameter of the port being less than the diameter of the microchannel and does not teach "none of the liquid enters the fluid interface port".

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 1797

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-22 and 24-41 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims (1-28,58-150) and (1-45) of copending Application No. 10/028,852 and 10/057,354 respectively. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are directed to a microfluidic device having a virtual wall.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-22 and 24-41 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,528. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are directed to a microfluidic device having a virtual wall. This patent is silent to the claimed dimension of the interface port.

The court decided In re Rose (105 USPQ 237) “ ... the size of the article under consideration which is not ordinarily a matter of invention .” Additionally, it is desirable to make microfluidic devices as small as possible to minimize the volumes of reagents and samples. This minimization saves in the cost of the reagents and conserves the samples for further testing.

It would have been within the skill of the art to modify USP 6,877,528 and have channels and ports in the device meeting the claimed size of the channels and as the dimensions chosen for the channels would not ordinarily be a matter of invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-22, 24-41 and 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Fuchs (USP 5,757,482).

See the appropriate paragraph of the 11/9/06 rejections.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7/9/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**Double Patenting Rejections**

Applicant traverses the non-statutory and statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Applicants state to expedite the prosecution, terminal disclaimers will be filed upon resolution of all other outstanding issues. The Office maintains the non-statutory and statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejections are proper. These rejection can be overcome by the filing of the proper and timely terminal disclaimer.

**35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections**

Applicant's state page 5 lines 4-6 of the original specification provide support for the limitation that the "... microchannel is larger than the diameter of the fluid interface

Art Unit: 1797

port..." The Office has consulted page 5 of the specification and notes the specification teaches the "... the lateral dimensions of fluid interface port(17) are substantially identical to or less than the diameter of the microchannel(3) ..." which does not naturally flow to encompass the pending claim language of "significantly smaller." The Office maintains the claimed "significantly smaller" is not taught or supported by the original specification. Additionally, it is not clear if the claimed "depth" is analogous to the specification's teaching of "diameter." Clarification could be achieved by using the language from the specification on page 21 lines 4-5 verbatim.

Applicants state page 21 lines 4-28 support the claim language "... the virtual wall is formed, such that none of the liquid enters the fluid interface port". The Office has considered this portion of the specification and believes it teaches the "dead volume" is the volume of liquid not flushed through the fluid interface and is "... most preferably about zero." There is no discussion in this portion of the specification relating to the virtual wall and the Office maintains the above 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejections. Rather, the original specification (e.g. see page 16 lines 10-20) teaches adding fluid through the port(17) which appears to contradict the new limitations.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Applicant states the independent claims 1,15,48 and 49 specify that none of the liquid in the microchannel flow into the interface port when the virtual wall is formed. In light of the above 35 USC 112 first paragraph issues, it is onto clear if there is support in the original disclosure for this language. Even if there were support, the pending independent claims are directed to a "Method of forming a fluid interface port ...", " A

Art Unit: 1797

Microfluidic structure ...", " A microfluidic structure ..." and " A method of forming a fluid interface port ..." respectively. All of the pending claims are directed to either a method of making a structure or the structure alone. None of the claims are directed to a method of using the structure. The Office maintains the cited prior art teaches the claimed structures and methods of making the claimed structures and have been properly read on the claims. The argued issue of the "virtual wall" is not a structural limitations of the device, but rather seems to relate more closely to the method of using the device which is not presently claimed. The Office maintains all of the rejections of record are proper.

Applicants argue the cited prior art fails to teach "... a device ... with a constant depth ...". These remarks are not commensurate in scope with the pending claims where "constant depth" has been deleted.

Applicants state the cited prior art fails to teach the "depth" of the port is "substantially smaller than the diameter of the fluid interface port". The Office maintains the language "smaller than" is sufficiently broad to have been properly read on the cited prior art.

Applicant's remarks concerning Chow were convincing and the rejections have been vacated.

Applicants remarks concerning Handique were convincing the rejections have been vacated.

Applicants state the port(24) taught by Fuchs must be at least 400 microns thick and cannot be less than the channel which is 10-1000 microns. The Office does not

Art Unit: 1797

agree because Fusch only teaches 400 microns as a *preferred embodiment*. Fuchs teach in column 5 lines 9-12 the cover(20) is at least 10 microns which has been read on the claimed depth of the port “significantly smaller” than the diameter of the interface port.

### ***Conclusion***

This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 10/027,516. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.



Art Unit: 1797

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lyle A Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-1254. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday or Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Lyle A Alexander/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

Lyle A Alexander  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1743